DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 738 SP 010 788

TITLE Naticnal Issues in Education Professions Development. Fall 1976.
INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on Education Professions Develcpment, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 67p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Legislation; Educational Policy; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Policy Formation; Political Issues; *Professional Education; Professional Training; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Education Professions Development Act

ABSTRACT

This report presents views on issues facing policymakers as they consider changes in federal support for the training and retraining of teachers and staff in America's schools and colleges. It is organized in three sections. The first is a brief history of the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) of 1967 which sketches legislative backgrounds, the renewal scheme, and the EPDA summative evaluation. The second section presents seven national issues in education professions development: (1) centralization vs. decentralizatien; (2) evaluation, oversight, and advisory councils; (3) strengthening the science of teacher education; (4) the politics of governance in teacher education; (5) the economics of teacher education--who pays, who benefits; (6) the demographics of teacher education--changing needs; and (7) additional unresolved issues. The third sectien provides concluding remarks. Appendix A lists categorical federal programs for training educational personnel; Appendix B explains and lists federal programs providing for professional development. (MM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to ctain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

SP

ED135738

National Issues in Education Professions Development

FALL 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development

SP 013 718

National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development

Suite 308 · 1111 20th Street N.W. · Washington, DC 20036 · (202) 653-6169

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

This special report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development presents our views on certain issues facing policymakers as they consider changes in Federal support for the training and retraining of teachers and staff in America's schools and colleges. In accord with our mandate, the report is directed to members of Congress and officers of the Administration who have responsibility for making Federal policy in education. It is brief because we respect your and their time, and not because we have little to say.

In 1967, responding to a proclaimed nation-wide teacher shortage and the need to coordinate and modernize Federal programs in teacher training, Congress passed the Education Professions Development Act. At the same time, it created the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development with oversight of this legislation, and of other Federal programs relating to the training of educational professionals. This Act has been on the books for nearly a decade, and it is appropriate to present a retrospective summary of what has been learned from it.

EPDA has never been fully implemented by the Executive Branch nor fully supported by the Congress. The original legislation had great potential and was directed to genuine needs in education, needs that still exist. By general agreement, some EPDA programs were unwisely implemented, the most glaring example being the scheme for "educational renewal." It is also true that resources made available by Congress were never adequate for achieving the expected massive changes in teacher education. There has been much dissension over EPDA's purposes, both within the Office of Education and within the education professions, so that a solid constituency in support of the legislation has been difficult to achieve. The coordinating role of EPDA has been ignored by Congress, so that between 1968 and 1975 at least thirty new and separate categorical teacher training programs were created outside the blanket scope of EPDA, more in fact than had existed in 1967 when EPDA was enacted. While a strong emphasis in the legislation was improvement in the quality of teacher education, this has been overlooked by those who think of EPDA as an effort only to produce more teachers. On this issue, the Senate Report (94-882) on the Education Amendments of 1976 approvingly quotes a teacher education spokesman as follows: "There is no teacher surplus; there is an educational deficit." We fully concur with this assessment.

The Council believes there is a continuing Federal role and responsibility in education professions development. A national evaluation of teacher

education is vitally needed, and with it an adequate Federal program to help bring about improvement. New and old teachers alike are not adequately prepared for the changes that society, technology, and the mandates of the courts have brought to the classroom. We may have enough teachers, but we certainly do not have enough with the skills that are now required. We also support the idea of the National Institute of Education, and endorse the need for Congressional support for research in education, both basic and applied.

The Federal role in support of education should be supportive without being coercive. In believing that policymaking should reflect local as well as national concerns, the Council supports the idea of block grants for education, funds which are to be used to supplement but not replace funds for education provided by State and local governments.

The reform of teacher education has proved to be a complex task. The Federal government cannot expect to achieve substantial changes in teacher education without a coherent strategy and sustained support. Before promulgating any new programs, Congress and the Executive Branch should benefit from the experience under EPDA and similar programs. Whether called EPDA or something else, flexible legislative authority still is needed, as it was in 1967, to carry out the Federal responsibility for the coordination and modernization of teacher education.

The roles and responsibilities of Federal advisory councils are in need of evaluation and revision. Concern for the structure, use, and "clout" of advisory councils has been voiced by the Congress, the Executive Branch, and by advisory councils themselves. The main issues include the following: First, Executive agencies often provide inadequate access to program data, so that advisory councils cannot offer relevant assessment and advice. Second, the advice of advisory councils too often is sought after the fact, when policy decisions have already been made, rather than in the early formative stages of policymaking when their advice and expertise could be most useful. Third, to the extent that patronage is a more important criterion in making advisory council appointments than concern for the general welfare, the quality of advisory councils will suffer. Advisory councils will be of little use if they see their role as that of apologists for the Executive Branch or as advocates of particular, political points of view.

We strongly urge Congress and the Administration to consider the points raised in this report, and developed more fully in earlier reports, and then to take appropriate action to meet the critical need for more adequate substantive training for the nation's teachers. Without this, the quality of all education is itself in critical danger, and a disaster from which the Nation will not soon rise lies before us. It is difficult to imagine a more important priority for our Nation's Bicentennial.

Sincerely,

Walter Tice
Chairman

Enclosure

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Walter Tice, *Chairman**
Yonkers, New York

R. Creighton Buck*
Madison, Wisconsin

Judy Ann Buffmire
Salt Lake City, Utah

Manera A. Constantine
Wilmington, Delaware

Mildred M. Curtis
Minden, Nebraska

Carol Doherty
Taunton, Massachusetts

Archie R. Dykes
Lawrence, Kansas

Helen G. Edmonds*
Durham, North Carolina

Janet Erickson*
San Marino, California

Henry Lucas, Jr.
San Francisco, California

Edward A. Medina, *Treasurer*
Espanola, New Mexico

Jeanne Noble
New York, New York

Martin W. Schoppmeyer*
Fayetteville, Arkansas

William Ransom Wood
Fairbanks, Alaska

* *Member's term expired April 26, 1976. This Report was approved in principle by the Council at its meeting on March 5, 1976. The final report was adopted on June 11, 1976. Mr. Tice was reappointed Chairman on June 30, 1976.*

STAFF

George Arnstein
Executive Director

Mary E. Dilworth
Research Assistant

David C. Nichols
Associate Director

Stephen D. Ward
Research Assistant

Anne C. Coldren
Staff Assistant

Contents

	Page
Letter of Transmittal	
Members of the Council	
1. A Brief History of EPDA	1
A. Legislative Backgrounds	1
B. The Renewal Scheme	5
C. EPDA--A Summative Evaluation	7
2. National Issues in Education Professions Development	12
A. Centralization vs. Decentralization	12
B. Evaluation, Oversight, and Advisory Councils	15
C. Strengthening the Science of Teacher Education	18
D. The Politics of Governance in Teacher Education	20
E. The Economics of Teacher Education--Who Pays, Who Benefits?	21
F. The Demographics of Teacher Education: Changing Needs	25
G. Additional Unresolved Issues	27
3. Conclusion	29
Footnotes	30
Appendix A: Categorical Federal Programs for Training Educational Personnel	32
Appendix B: Federal Programs Providing Professional Development	34

1. A Brief History of EPDA

The Education Professions Development Act of 1967 was intended to put Federal support behind a sweeping restructuring of teacher education in the United States. The purpose of this chapter is to trace the history of the Education Professions Development Act, to assess its accomplishments and shortcomings. There is much to be learned in this history of trial and error if future Federal efforts are to benefit from past experience.

A. Legislative Backgrounds

EPDA was signed into law on June 29, 1967. Its historical roots go back a decade earlier to the post-Sputnik era under President Eisenhower which produced the National Defense Education Act, the Cooperative Research Act (the first large-scale Federal support for research in education), and stimulated Congressional interest in the improvement of science teaching in the schools. The fear of Soviet space supremacy was coupled with a widespread belief that something needed to be done to overhaul the education of teachers in the United States. The immediate result, about 1958, was a great rush to establish institutes for teachers under NDEA and under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. The momentum generated by Sputnik was sustained by new Federal programs that would have been unthinkable beforehand.[1/]

In the landslide of social welfare legislation passed by

Congress in the mid 1960's, the Education Professions Development Act of 1967 was designed to consolidate teacher training programs scattered among the many education laws passed since NDEA in 1958. Some of these programs had been collected under the original Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Title V established: (1) the Teacher Corps, to provide experienced teachers and interns for schools in areas having high concentrations of low-income families; (2) fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education by persons pursuing or planning to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education; and (3) grants to pay part of the costs of improving teacher training programs in institutions of higher education.

According to Samuel Halperin (who was a key officer in HEW for education legislation when EPDA was enacted):

> Under President Johnson, some 30 or 40 educational programs had been passed, and only in late 1966 did we realize that they didn't mesh, that there was a real lack of balance. We also realized that, as far as teachers went, we didn't have the desired degree of quality or, in quite a few specialized areas, the quantity.... But it wouldn't have been enough to put them all under one authority and leave them categorical programs. After all, some were pre-service, some in-service, some could run only summer institutes, while others were limited to fellowships. None of these programs in teacher training had the kind of flexibility we thought was important. What was missing was the means to determine what was needed, and the flexible discretionary authority to respond to those needs.[2]

Late in 1966 HEW Secretary John W. Gardner and Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II appointed an HEW task force to study the situation and present recommendations for a Federal

education manpower policy. After a study of several months, the task force concluded that new legislation was needed for teacher training because: (1) there was a teacher shortage; (2) existing teacher training authorities were scattered, excessively categorical, and inflexible; (3) there was no mechanism for the assessment of teachers' needs; and (4) the existing program provided little leverage for encouraging changes in conventional practices in training institutions or schools.[3/]

After debate in the Congress over the Administration's proposal, the legislation was duly passed and President Lyndon Johnson signed EPDA into law (P.L. 90-35) on June 29, 1967. In addition to consolidating various existing training authorities, a new feature of EPDA was Part D which authorized the Commissioner "to make grants and contracts for programs to improve training and retraining opportunities for educational personnel, including pre-service and in-service programs." Part D is the basis for the "discretionary authority" of EPDA, which allowed the Office of Education to establish funding priorities and criteria for programs. This section of the law has been a primary source of controversy.

As did most people at the time, those responsible for implementing EPDA believed there was a teacher shortage and that it would continue. In the prefatory language of EPDA, the adjective critical is used three times to describe the personnel shortage in education. By 1970 this "critical shortage" gave signs of turning into an abundance and much

of the argument behind EPDA became attenuated. In 1967, however, when the law came into being, there were high hopes that EPDA would eventually revolutionize the system of training teachers in the United States.

In February 1968 a new bureau, the Bureau of Education Professions Development, was established to administer EPDA. According to Don Davies, its director, the inauguration of the bureau was marred by internal dissension. This dissension, mainly between the new staff and those who headed the programs in existence before EPDA--Teacher Corps and the teacher's institutes--apparently continued for some time. The internal dissension was matched by external disagreement over the purposes of EPDA. Everybody in the field--from classroom teachers to school board members and education faculty--saw EPDA as pie-in-the-sky for his or her own pet idea for reform or renewal of American education. Everybody wanted a part of the action. In the first year, some 3200 proposals for grants were received, asking for some $1 billion. With an appropriation of some $25 million (for Part D) BEPD was hard pressed to sort, evaluate, and make grants intelligently. Eventually Part D was given over largely to the TTT (Trainers of Teacher Trainers--meaning college faculty) and the COP (Career Opportunities Program).

The substance and strategy of the BEPD programs was a complex of efforts to revitalize teacher education through ideas about reforms which OE leaders thought were needed in education. These are perhaps best expressed by Davies himself.

He identifies two themes central to the strategy that was developed to administer EPDA: First, a "partnership" among colleges, schools, and communities in planning, carrying out, and evaluating programs for personnel development; second, combining teacher training and school reform. Both of these strategies were developed in the context that the primary commitment of EPDA should be to improve education for disadvantaged children.

According to Davies, the area of greatest controversy in his strategy was the way in which grants were made. Grants went directly to school systems, "making it possible for them to negotiate from a position of strength with colleges and universities, while requiring them to include the community in their decision-making." Davies believed that the competition for funding with school systems and competition from alternative training institutions such as teacher centers would be a strong motivation for colleges to reform themselves and to share some of their power with the schools. He believed, he says, that the existing condition of near monopoly would not produce much change.

B. The Renewal Scheme

In 1971 the Bureau of Education Professions Development was in difficulty. Merrow describes the situation as follows:

> It was top heavy with fifteen programs, short of money, and publicly defined as a teacher training organization at a time when many teachers were out of work... BEPD was a prime candidate for executive and Congressional axes.4/

According to Merrow, "educational renewal" was the outcome of a combined need to do something about BEPD and to help OE out of the dilemmas it faced relative to the establishment of the National Institute of Education. It seemed to many that OE would have little to do except to write checks if NIE were established.

> The new Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland, Jr., grasped at the straw of "teacher centers," called it "educational renewal," and drew up plans for consolidating all of OE's discretionary authority (about $261 million). All of this flexible authority was to be put under one lock and key and the key handed to Dr. Don Davies, by then the deputy commissioner for renewal.5/

"Renewal" was an attempt to set up comprehensive teacher retraining centers, on a demonstration basis, in several locations around the country. The outcome of this "strategy" was a disaster. Key members of Congress concerned with education took umbrage at what they perceived to be an unlawful attempt on the part of the Office of Education to change Congressional intent. Senator Pell and Congressman Brademas, chairmen of two education subcommittees, opposed "renewal," and they said so in no uncertain terms. The battle for strategy, led by Commissioner Marland, was no contest. Before it was over, Marland was accused on the Senate floor of misrepresentation. "Renewal" was blocked by Congress while OE lost much of its discretionary authority and incurred the wrath of Congress.6/

After the debacle of "renewal," EPDA's future looked bleak indeed. Funding (including Teacher Corps) had peaked

at $133 million in 1972; it fell to $102 million in 1973, dropped to $92 million in 1974, and then plunged to $46 million ($37.5 million of which was for Teacher Corps) in 1975. Senator Pell introduced legislation to kill EPDA (except for Teacher Corps) as part of the Education Amendments of 1974. The Senate passed the legislation, but when the issue reached the House-Senate Conference in August 1974, the House prevailed and the item was deleted. EPDA narrowly escaped repeal. Its future continues to be uncertain.

C. EPDA--A Summative Evaluation

Don Davies believes that EPDA helped to reform teacher education. He lists these reforms as follows, describing them as some "good things" that happened because of EPDA:

- -- more training of teachers and teacher trainees was done in schools and communities, less in college classrooms;
- -- college people, teachers, school administrators, and community representatives talked and listened to one another in a sustained and systematic way;
- -- some revisions in both college and school district staff development practices occurred (e.g., more credit for on-the-job activities and learning, more courses and experiences dealing with community problems and concerns, better links between theory and practice);
- -- specific mechanisms were established providing decision-making authority to those who had previously had little or none: teachers and parents.[7]

Some planning and evaluation occurred in BEPD, but Davies in retrospect describes these efforts as "too little, too narrow, too late." There was little "formative" evaluation, too little attention to evaluation and policy analysis in the

beginning, when programs were being launched. Moreover, Davies believes that the conflicts in EPDA's purposes make the task of judging its success and failure not only difficult but almost meaningless.

> At this time (1974) it is safe to conclude only that the way in which EPDA was administered and the results of that administration satisfied some people and groups not at all and some people and groups only partially. It's safe to say that for nearly everyone much of the dream ended in frustration. It's safe to say that the impact of EPDA on education was not overwhelming and certainly less than might have been expected.[8]

Davies lists the flaws of EPDA as follows:

-- there were too many EPDA programs, resulting in diffusion of limited resources;

-- there were already in existence when EPDA was passed scores of other training programs in every school district, each with its own guidelines and time schedule; EPDA had a limited and unclear institutional impact;

-- EPDA did not fit in with the Nixon Administration's plans for revenue sharing with the States, nor with plans for the development of the National Institute of Education, which was supposed to house all R & D activity.[9]

Our independent assessment of EPDA concurs largely with Davies'. There probably were too many programs developed too quickly without adequate analysis of need, with insufficient attention to alternative courses of action that might have been taken, and with too much optimism about EPDA as a lever for reform in American education. Finally, the "renewal" fiasco put EPDA beyond the pale. It is one thing to administer programs untidily; it is quite another for an administrative agency to flout the prerogatives of Congress.

8

Historical shifts have also been critical, if inexorable, factors bearing on the success or failure of EPDA. First, while the original EPDA called for improvements in the quality of teacher preparation and retraining, it is clear both from the congressional debates surrounding passage of the legislation and the actual language of the law itself that the issue of teacher quantity was extremely important to getting the legislation through Congress. As everyone knows, there has been a substantial change in the supply and demand situation for teachers since the original passage of EPDA. By 1970-71, it was fairly clear that supply and demand had indeed begun to balance out, for the first time in nearly 20 years. The "baby boom" was ending, and so was the leap in school enrollments. Projections for additional certificated teachers by the National Center for Educational Statistics show a "bottoming out" of the recent decline in demand by 1979-80 and an anticipated upswing in demand beginning in 1980-81.10/

Second, there has been a profound change in public attitudes about the utility of Federal programs aimed at achieving social reforms. The reform of teacher education has proved to be a complex task. Growing pressure on public resources, coupled with the inconclusive impact of programs under EPDA, has encouraged Federal budgeters to prune reform programs. According to the FY 77 HEW Budget, the so-called "noncontrollables"--mandated health and social security payments--in the HEW budget account for more than 97% of the department's

expenditures; education, in comparison, is "controllable" and, in light of that criterion, of lower priority to those under pressure to cut outlays.11/

The inconclusive nature of EPDA's formal evaluations has not helped to strengthen a case for its continuation. Most of the formal external evaluations of EPDA programs were virtually worthless for policymaking purposes, since they were done after the programs had been dissolved. Most important perhaps, an intensive study, "Decisionmaking in the Bureau of Education Professions Development," requested and funded by the Council in 1970-71, showed little if any evidence that the findings of evaluations had any impact on the decisions of program managers. Evaluations too often were irrelevant because the programs under EPDA did not operate long enough for the results of the evaluations to be useful, or because of political considerations, or because of the inadequacies of the evaluations themselves, or because no one cared.

To sum up, EPDA has not been a success in recent years if the ability not only to survive but to thrive is the criterion. By general agreement, it is fair to say that the programs were not uniformly well administered. Changing political and economic circumstances strongly affected EPDA's mission. Some of the assumptions underlying change in teacher education were tested in EPDA and found wanting. On the other hand, some useful things came out of EPDA. Thousands of teachers benefitted from programs to train or retrain them, to update their skills and knowledge. For the first time

ever, national leverage was given to long overdue reforms in teacher education. There is much to be learned in this history of trial and error if future Federal efforts are to benefit from past experience.

2. National Issues in Education Professions Development

By general agreement among those concerned about quality in the education professions, there is a distinctive Federal role and responsibility in education professions development. Important needs are not being met by State and local governments. It remains to be determined which levels of government, as well as which types of institutions (teacher centers, colleges, the schools, etc.) are best suited to support each part of the total task. Current needs include support for in-service training, research and development, supply and demand studies. Before promulgating new and different programs, Congress and the Administration should study past experience under EPDA. A national evaluation of teacher education is in order to lay the groundwork for reform strategies.

In this section of the report we present our views on some unresolved issues concerning the Federal role in the education of teachers and other educational personnel. These issues arise from our experience with EPDA and our knowledge of teacher education.

A. Centralization vs. Decentralization

One of the original purposes of EPDA was to consolidate and coordinate scattered training authorities. In 1976 there are even more categorical training authorities than there were before EPDA, and there is little central coordination and administrative leadership. Since EPDA was enacted in

1967, additional legislation has authorized training funds for teachers of the handicapped, bilingual education, and others. According to a survey conducted by the Council, there are now some 30 separate training programs operating in OE.[12/] Training funds are now provided through categorical legislation instead of EPDA.

P.L. 93-380 (the Education Amendments of 1974) gives the Commissioner of Education a certain amount of flexibility to establish his own priorities for special needs in education and to carry out a limited number of projects of his own choosing, with the consent of Congress. This authority, the so-called Special Projects Act, gives the Commissioner "discretionary authority" similar to that of Part D of EPDA. It is conceivable that if the Commissioner wanted to do so he could elevate in-service training of regular classroom teachers to a high priority and, with the consent of Congress, launch new programs. While this is conceivable, it is not very likely, given the current funding situation and other factors.

Moreover, under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, local education agencies may now use Federal funds to support in-service training of teachers if they choose to do so. The point is that there is some limited legislative authority for Federal support to in-service training of regular teachers. Realistically, however, budget pressures make in-service training a lower priority than either prudence or experience would support.

Teacher Corps continues to be one of the main Federal

programs for in-service teacher education. With an annual expenditure of approximately $37.5 million, Teacher Corps is in position to develop model training programs that could be emulated by school systems if they can only find the funds to sustain the programs. The President's budget for FY 77 continues Teacher Corps at a level of $37.5 million. Since enactment of the Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380), Teacher Corps has been authorized to provide in-service training for virtually all staff in a given Teacher Corps project. The potential of the Corps for effecting reforms in the schools has never been greater. Nevertheless, Teacher Corps by itself cannot possibly provide all the leadership and support needed since it reaches only a small fraction of all teachers.

In view of the fact that there are many Federal education training programs, we believe that the Office of Education should have some administrative mechanism to coordinate training programs now scattered over many different bureaus, to provide assessment and evaluation of training programs, and to offer technical assistance to the various agencies authorized to conduct training programs. As matters now stand, the various program managers have limited opportunity and incentives to learn from each other's errors--or successes.

This coordinating office should have sufficient authority to give it effective influence. At a minimum, some kind of "sign-off" authority seems necessary, a procedure whereby the training coordinator would approve the design of training

programs of the various agencies. Evaluation, both formative and summative, should be integral to the entire effort.

B. Evaluation, Oversight, and Advisory Councils

Considerable improvement could be made in the way the Office of Education incorporates the findings of evaluation and research, the views of interested citizens, and the advice of experts, into program design and development. An advisory body could perform an important function by monitoring this process. In the case of EPDA, there is general agreement that too little evaluation was done, too late. Formative, rather than summative, evaluation especially was needed to help develop programs before they were launched, to screen funding priorities carefully. EPDA demonstrates a great deal about what does and doesn't work in education. It is pointless to blame past leaders for failure to know this in advance.

Advisory councils, as the name suggests, are not intended to be policymaking bodies. But the Congress intended that they should be consulted and their advice should be listened to even if it is not followed. In the case of this Council, there was a mandated review function regarding the distribution of fellowships (P.L. 90-35, Section 523) that used to be observed back in the days when there were fellowships.

In more recent years, the Council has taken a more critical stance toward the Office of Education while the Administration has laid plans to phase-out EPDA. Relations

between OE and the Council have been perfunctory and there is little evidence that the advice of the Council has been sought or listened to. Last year, by way of illustrating the lack of consultation, the Commissioner of Education proposed a new program for the training of school principals at a proposed annual expenditure of $3 million, an initiative included in the President's budget for FY 76, without once consulting the Council or asking its advice.

Concern for the structure, use, and "clout" of advisory councils has been voiced by representatives of the Administration, Congress and by the advisory councils themselves.13/ The main issues follow:

1. Inadequate access to program data. Without adequate information about program operations, advisory councils cannot provide relevant assessment and advice. Some agencies find every conceivable bureaucratic excuse to delay if not withhold the sharing of data. The experience of this Council with the Office of Education is spotty. Some agencies routinely provide all data requested. Others are unresponsive in spirit if not in fact. To reduce this problem, legislation should make provision for routine sharing of program data, in systematic "reporting" format, by agency heads with the appropriate advisory council.

2. Involvement in the development of policy. Advisory councils have been appointed to provide informed and unbiased advice on needs, problems, and possible solutions. To limit a Council's role to program evaluation, to the exclusion of

providing input on and reviewing policy, is a waste of resources. Legislation should explicitly state a council's responsibility in advising on policy formulation. Additionally, agencies should be required by statute to respond promptly to the recommendations of advisory councils, giving reasons why the recommendations either can or cannot be accepted.

3. Selection of council members. Recent Congressional hearings indicate that many persons believe open selection procedures would improve the quality of appointments to advisory councils. To the extent that patronage is a more important criterion in making appointments than concern for the general welfare, the quality of councils will suffer. Advisory councils also may benefit from the participation of "consumers" of the programs. Students, young and old, could make a valuable contribution to the work of education advisory councils. Moreover, advisory councils will be of little use if they see their role as that of apologists for the Administration or as advocates of particular, political points of view. Legislation should provide means of opening up the appointments process to public review.

4. Ad hoc or permanent councils. Opinions differ on whether advisory councils should be explicitly ad hoc or whether they should be closely tied to the life history of a particular program. Some believe that advisory councils should be established independently of the programs they advise so that they will have no particular stake in the rise and fall of the program in question. To the extent

that advisory bodies are more objective and disinterested when they are ad hoc in nature, their usefulness will be enhanced. On the other hand, long-term advisory bodies will have detailed knowledge about programs and will be able to offer advice of a more specific, technical nature. While there may be no single best model, at the very least measures should be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of advisory councils and steps be taken to change them when appropriate.

C. Strengthening the Science of Teacher Education

There is considerable concern among educators over the adequacy of the base of scientific research that supports the practice of teaching. The Council shares this concern. We believe in the idea of the National Institute of Education and urge more support from Congress for research in education, both basic and applied. The search for an improved science of teaching and learning must be pressed with all deliberate speed.

Meantime, the hue and cry goes on for improving the quality of education. We continue to believe that teachers make a great difference in the quality of education. While the findings of research are mixed and inconclusive, and while it is doubtless true that schools cannot overcome all limitations on a child's environment, teachers and schools have the capacity to make an enormous difference in the lives of children. This view is in keeping with the research findings of James S. Coleman.[14/] In a summary of all the main

research findings on the differences teachers made to students, Alexander M. Mood, a researcher himself, writes:

> Some teachers make a huge difference; some teachers make a large or medium or a small difference; a few teachers may even do more harm than good. But all teachers desire to make a big difference; they would find tremendous satisfaction in making a big difference; they would make a big difference if we would tell them how; we could if we would put some real effort into it.15/

The experimental competency based education movement has an aim of identifying teacher competencies that correspond to learning gains among students.16/ Both in CBTE and in basic and applied research in education, emphasis should be given to synthesizing, evaluating, and disseminating research findings aimed at improving the quality of teachers and of student learning. Much of this is included in the current mission of NIE and the educational laboratories.

Much of what was attempted under EPDA could be categorized as research and development, which is now being carried out largely by the National Institute of Education. Some programs were inadequately designed, haphazardly evaluated, too hastily put into operation without experimentation. Now that NIE has been established, the time has come for the education communities to stop quarreling among themselves and support NIE. In a time of shrinking Federal largesse, there will be elements of the education community who will prosper more than others in terms of Federal research support. This is inevitable. The danger is that the entire effort to improve scientific research in NIE may crumble for lack of an effective, unified constituency. Holding it all together is a task of leadership in the educational community.

D. The Politics of Governance in Teacher Education

Not too long ago the universities and the colleges of teacher education controlled the curricula, school boards the means, and State certification agencies the terms of teacher education requirements. Teachers had little authority. This is no longer the case. The growth of collective bargaining, the demands for participation by teachers in decisions affecting them, have changed things.

The phenomenon of teacher centers is one example of a response to the ferment going on in the governance of teacher education. In part stimulated by Federal efforts under EPDA, the teacher center often provides a neutral turf--combining the interests of the universities, school boards, and especially the teachers themselves in developing the content and method of in-service education. According to several recent studies, teacher centers have grown by leaps and bounds and now show signs of consolidating their gains. This represents a major shift in the process of educating a profession.

The point to be made here is that any strategy to improve teacher education will almost certainly become embroiled in the governance issue. One thing seems certain: In the future, teachers themselves will have a strong voice in the content and process of their own professional development. It also seems likely that teachers increasingly will demand more effective training programs.

We have pointed out that the current situation facing

policymakers, in view of the expected reassessment of Federal support to teacher education, is even more critical than the situation of the early 1960's before EPDA was enacted. There are dozens of new categorical Federal programs providing support for specialized training needs. There is little support in any legislation for the continuous retraining of regular classroom teachers, on an on-going basis, to help them keep current and fresh for their teaching responsibilities. The interests and needs of regular classroom teachers are inadequately reflected in Federally sponsored programs for teacher retraining.

E. The Economics of Teacher Education--Who Pays, Who Benefits?

Unlike other professionals, teachers and other educators are economically dependent. Most are, by necessity, employees of schools, colleges, and other institutions. The education profession, moreover, is not self-governing as most other professions are. And the income differential between educators and other professionals often is wide. For these and many other reasons, including the necessity for teachers to keep up to date for their teaching responsibilities, the "employers" of teachers--the various levels of government--have a special interest and responsibility to support and encourage in-service education.

At its peak, EPDA spent well over $100 million per year and barely scratched the surface in meeting the in-service training needs of American teachers. Considering the size

of the American teaching force--some three million teachers and college faculty--to provide retraining opportunities on a continuing basis could be very expensive. Even though a strong argument could be made that the benefits would outrun the costs, it seems highly unlikely that under present circumstances the amount of Federal aid will be expanded significantly in order to support substantial in-service training for general classroom teachers aimed at keeping teachers current and fresh for both the subject matter content and the methods to fulfill their teaching responsibilities.

For the sake of argument, however, several models of Federal involvement can be advanced. For example, one could arbitrarily set a goal of retraining a certain proportion of all teachers each year (say 10%), with the aim of reaching all teachers in a stated number of years (say each decade). Unit costs could be established for retraining, involving institutions of higher education, teacher centers, or other delivery systems, and a systematic process could be developed. It would be fairly simple to establish models of funding, with recommended contributions from individual teachers, schools, and government agencies, so that each would share appropriately in the cost of teacher retraining.

Determining the "appropriate" contribution from each could be based on analysis of who benefits. For example, it can be argued that State and local agencies ought to contribute an amount in proportion to the benefits localities enjoy from having well educated teachers in the schools.

Likewise, the Federal "share" can be calculated, based on certain national goals or priorities of improving educational quality and opportunity. On their part, teachers could be expected to contribute either through dollars or time, based on the benefits they receive through increased income and status, not to mention personal satisfaction. Any scheme should take into account the need for better incentives to encourage teachers to participate voluntarily. Much already is being spent on inservice teacher training by individual teachers and by State and local governments. While situations vary from State to State and even from locality to locality, it would be feasible to develop model formulae for legislation of this kind that would virtually guarantee a retraining cycle for all American teachers, with all three levels of government--and the teachers themselves--paying for a share of the costs.

A different approach is to provide Federal funds as leverage to encourage States and localities to make their own decisions about a priority for in-service education. President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposals for education, and President Ford's block-grant proposals for education, are variations on this idea. The advantage of block grants is that they encourage more decisionmaking at the local level. The disadvantage is that there is no guarantee the local decisionmakers will find a way to provide for in-service training.

Other approaches would include direct subsidies to

teachers by which they could "purchase" the in-service training they want. A different but related approach would be to allow greater use of tax credits or deductions, through the Internal Revenue Service, for teachers and other professionals. At the other extreme, some people believe there should be no outlay of Federal funds for in-service training of teachers. Each approach has its own advantages and limitations. Personal values and ideologies, not to mention politics, will bear strongly on policy decisions.

The Council believes that the Federal role in support of education should be supportive without being coercive. Voices on all sides are critical of the constraining Federal compliance requirements and the mountains of paperwork. In believing that policymaking should reflect local as well as national concerns, the Council supports the idea of block grants for education, Federal funds used to supplement funds for education provided by State and local governments. Maintenance of effort is essential; otherwise the Federal government will simply be diverting local funds from education.

In supporting the idea of block grants, we are mindful of a caveat: providing Federal block grants for State and local use will be to little avail if the funds are used merely to expand the status quo, to enlarge State and local bureaucracies. Without safeguards, the hand of the State Capital can be every bit as heavy, if not heavier and clumsier, than the hand of the more distant Capital in Washington.

F. The Demographics of Teacher Education: Changing Needs

There has been some recent speculation, based in part on a published research report,[17] that the delining birth rate in the United States either already has or soon will "bottom out" because of the population bulge among women in their late 20's and early 30's, now the most fertile years for child-bearing. We have examined both the published research and the latest information from the National Center for Health Statistics. We have found no substance on which to base a prediction that the number of children entering school will increase significantly during the next five years. Moreover, with the divorce rate in the United States now at an all-time high, and the marriage rate at an all-time low, the number of live births may even decrease. Thus there are as yet no signs of a turnaround in the birth rate.[18] However, beyond this short-term projection, according to the Census Bureau's assumptions, there may be a significant increase in the elementary school population beginning in 1980-81.

While the number of openings for new teachers probably will not increase and may even decline (because of fiscal stringency) during the next five years, there may be a shortfall of teachers beyond this period. If there is an overreaction by students against becoming teachers for fear of lagging market demand or other reasons, then it is conceivable that there could be a shortage of teachers in the early 1980's. According to the results of a survey by Astin, only 6.5 percent of 1975-76 college first-year students plan

to be elementary or secondary school teachers, compared with 8.2 percent in 1974 and 21.7 percent in 1966. According to Astin, "This is a consistent and ominous trend way out of line with any conservative predictions about a change in the birth rate."[19/] The demand for new teachers is strongly affected by attrition and turnover. In the recent past the schools have needed many thousands of new teachers each year to fill positions created by attrition. Even though attrition very likely will decline (or many positions very likely will be collapsed, not filled) there continues to be a demand for new teachers even though there are not enough openings to go around. For the first time in many years, the schools can afford to be very selective in hiring practices.

Despite attrition and turnover, a very large proportion of the teachers now teaching in the schools will also be teaching twenty years from now. How will these teachers keep abreast of new knowledge in their fields, maintain freshness and vitality for their teaching responsibilities? Without the constant infusion of new blood into the teaching profession, how will the schools and the profession renew themselves? There is an enormous challenge here for public policy at Federal, State, and local levels.

An optimal approach to resolution of the teacher training question would be some form of systematic plan involving a division of labor among the various levels of government. Such a plan should develop attractive incentives to encourage participation by teachers and others, and utilize the

distinctive contributions of different delivery systems, including the colleges, teacher centers, and the schools.

A systematic national plan will not be developed overnight. One option now available is to maintain a shell EPDA, including the present Part D (which gives the Commissioner discretionary authority to fund certain kinds of education training programs). The Administration itself proposed last year a modest appropriation under EPDA for the in-service training of school principals. Other examples of need abound.[20/]

The purpose and advantage of maintaining a contingency authorization is that when the economy can stand it, the Congress and the Administration will then be in position to appropriate funds for systematic retraining programs for regular classroom teachers, based on appropriate division of labor and collaboration with States and localities.

G. Additional Unresolved Issues

There are substantial issues bearing on teacher preparation that range beyond the limits of this report. Questions about quality indices, including declining standardized test scores of school children, concern us all. Many others are concerned about what they believe to be an extensive societal concern for equalitarianism at the expense of excellence. Some think the schools are being asked to do much that is beyond education, the solving of society's problems. It seems likely that the debate over "trade-offs" between equality

and excellence, "education" and societal problem solving, will continue for a long time to come. Such issues as "limits to growth" pose additional challenges to Federal policy, largely unrecognized. We also note the continuing need for school personnel trained to deal effectively with the handicapped, the bilingual, and adults. Career education vs. liberal education, disciplinary content vs. methods in education, and a host of other topics doubtless will continue to wax and wane in importance--and Federal priority.

The single vital statistic that might affect increased enrollment in educational institutions is the death rate, which in 1974 was the lowest on record. The effects of this change may be felt in adult education programs and in special programs for the elderly. In keeping with a trend of several years, there is a continuing upward bulge in the average age. The fact is that the population in the United States is growing older. There are extensive implications here for public policy.

3. Conclusion

The burden of past failures in education professions development weighs heavily on all of us. Many programs have been initiated in recent years that have failed to produce the expected dramatic results. By general agreement, EPDA programs have not been uniformly well administered, nor have its strategists been especially adroit in maintaining Congressional confidence in what they are doing. While substantial, resources made available have never been adequate for massive change, even if one assumes that the strategies adopted were good ones. Not surprising in a field of education so ripe for reforms and yet so intractible, EPDA has produced high hopes and equivocal outcomes in teacher education. Some of the assumptions underlying EPDA were tested and found wanting. While on the whole EPDA has not been as successful as its advocates expected, the fact remains that many of the needs that gave rise to EPDA in the first place still exist. Whether it is called EPDA or something else, legislative authority still is needed to carry out the Federal responsibility for educational staff training and retraining, and to provide improved coordination for existing programs.

Footnotes

1. This history of EPDA is based largely on unpublished work, especially Chapter III in a manuscript by David C. Nichols, "Shaping National Higher Education Policy: A Study of the Education Professions Development Act," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1976), available through Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

2. David Cohen, John Merrow, Ann Taylor, and Walter McCann, "The Role of Evaluation in Federal Education Training Programs," (unpublished manuscript), Center for Educational Policy Research, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1971, pp. 10-11.

3. Don Davies, "Reflections on EPDA," in Theory into Practice, Ohio State University School of Education, Volume XIII, Number 3, Columbus, Summer 1974, p. 210.

4. John Merrow, "The Politics of Federal Education Policy," in Teachers College Record, Volume 76, Number 1, September, 1974, p. 20.

5. Ibid., pp. 20-21.

6. This Council cautioned Congress and the Administration to give further study to "renewal" before any implementation. See A Report on Educational Renewal, National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Washington, D.C., 1972.

7. Davies, op.cit., p. 212.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p. 213.

10. Projections of Educational Statistics to 1984-85, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976, p. 63.

11. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "The Fiscal Year 1977 Budget," (an HEW press release), January 21, 1976, p. 3.

12. See Appendix A.

13. Gerald J. Kluempke, "A Descriptive Analysis of the Attitudes, Make-up, Function, and Utilization of Advisory Councils to the United States Office of Education," (unpublished dissertation, School of Education, The George Washington University, 1976).

14. James S. Coleman, in Do Teachers Make a Difference?, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1971 (OE-58042), pp. 174-75.

15. Alexander M. Mood, in Do Teachers Make a Difference?, op.cit., pp. 21-22.

16. See Competency Based Teacher Education: Toward a Consensus, National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Washington, D.C., Spring 1976.

17. June Sklar and Beth Berkov, "The American Birth Rate: Evidences of a Coming Rise," Science, August 29, 1975, pp. 693-699.

18. We wish to acknowledge the capable assistance of Anne Coldren of the Council's staff in conducting this analysis of demographic trends.

19. Alexander W. Astin, quoted in The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 12, 1976, p. 3.

20. The Council specified a wide range of current, unmet training needs in its recent report, Staffing the Learning Society: Recommendations for Federal Legislation, April 1975.

Appendix A

Categorical Federal Programs for

Training Educational Personnel

Training Outlays (in millions) FY 75, FY 76, and FY 77

	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77
Vocational Education			
Basic Grants to States (Does not include Innovation/Exemplary Programs & Projects Curriculum Development Programs Cooperative Programs)	13.4	13.1	50.6
Education of the Handicapped			
Special Education Manpower Development (Does not include Regional and Area Resource Centers Model Demonstration Projects for Children with Learning Disabilities)	35.5	36.7	41.6
Teacher Corps	14.9	25.7	35.4
Emergency School Aid (Civil Rights)			
Equal Education Opportunity Programs	15.1	11.6	14.2
Bilingual Education	8.2	10.0	10.1
Adult Education	5.4	5.0	5.6
Indian Education	3.6	3.7	4.1
Strengthening Developing Institutions	3.0	2.8	2.5
Women's Educational Equity	0	.5	2.2
Consumer's Education	0	.4	1.5
Right to Read	1.3	.8	1.4
Career Education	0	.6	.6
Gifted and Talented	0	.1	.3
Community Schools	0	.1	.2

	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77
Metric Education	0	0	.2
Arts in Education	0	0	.1
School Health and Nutrition	not available		
Educational Activities Overseas	0	.4	.4
Subtotal	100.4	111.5	171.0
Phase Out (Proposed for Elimination After FY 77)			
Higher Education			
College Teacher Fellowships	5.8	2.6	.2
CLEO-Council on Legal Educational Opportunities	.8	.8	0
Public Service Fellowships	0	3.6	.4
Mining Fellowships	0	1.4	.2
Educational Development	97.8*	14.8	1.3
EPDA			
Vocational Education	0	9.0	0
Urban-Rural	.02	5.5	4.0
COP-Career Opportunity Program	0	1.6	0
Other Personnel Development	0	2.1	0
Ethnic Heritage	0	1.8	0
Elementary and Secondary			
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Primary Prevention/ Early Intervention	0	2.2	2.0
Environmental Education	0	.6	0
Bilingual Vocational Education Training	0	2.8	0
Subtotal	104.4	40.7	8.1
TOTAL	204.8	152.2	179.1

* Approximately one-third of funds appropriated to the National Institute of Education, the remainder to various programs.

Chart based on data from U.S. Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Planning/U.S. Office of Education -- Administration's Request. FY 76 and FY 77 figures are estimated obligations.

Appendix B

Federal Programs Providing Professional Development

Approximately two hundred Federal programs support some form of professional development, according to the 1976 edition of the Office of Management and Budget's Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance. This represents an increase of approximately 15 percent over the number of Federal programs in this area in 1973.* These programs are dispersed throughout sixteen departments and agencies. While the bulk of the programs are administered by various segments of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a significant number of these programs can be found in the Justice Department, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Even though the total number of professional development programs has increased, the focus of these programs has shifted somewhat over the past several years. In the past, a number of programs supported general teacher development. However, many of these programs have been phased out, to be replaced with more specific programs to train teachers and others in particular areas such as health, career education, and other fields. Education professionals and others seeking support this year from the Federal government are more likely to succeed if they are willing to work in such areas as urban mass transit, law enforcement, or education for the handicapped.

* Cf. an earlier compilation in Appendix A, Staffing the Learning Society: Recommendations for Federal Legislation, National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development.

Based on a survey done by the Congressional Research Service, this list of Federal programs also includes the relevant House and Senate committees to which these programs are assigned for review. Many of the programs are the responsibility of the Education and Labor Committee in the House, and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Senate, as might be expected. But most of the health programs go to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the House, and other committees are represented on the list, such as Judiciary, Foreign Affairs/Relations, Banking, and Public Works. The listing in fact shows the wide dispersal of these professional development programs in Congressional committees.

It is worthwhile to look at some of the Federal departments and their programs in particular. Within HEW there has been an expansion of programs providing professional development in the health area, including alcohol, drug abuse and mental health training programs, as well as more general health manpower programs. In the field of education, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education is a significant funding source for faculty development. While programs supported under EPDA legislation have declined, new programs have been funded, many under the authority of the Education Amendments of 1974. Most of these programs support very specific kinds of educational professional development in areas such as metric, career, environmental, and bilingual education.

The Department of Justice has developed a number of new

programs providing professional development, again in specific areas of law enforcement training.

At the Energy Research and Development Administration (replacing one part of the old Atomic Energy Commission) similar activities are carried out compared to old AEC activities. However, the programs have been consolidated for the purposes of the OMB Catalog.

The Environmental Protection Agency is an organization providing a number of professional development programs which were not previously included in a listing of such programs.

At the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, the National Endowment for the Humanities in particular offers a number of programs for teachers, including summer seminars, stipends and fellowships of various sorts.

The National Science Foundation appears to have fewer programs supporting professional development. In fact it has also consolidated many of its programs supporting such activities into four broad areas. The new edition of the OMB Catalog reflects this consolidation.

Other agencies have generally maintained their support for professional development over the past two or three years. The following listing includes all these programs and the relevant Congressional committees.

A Note on Methodology

The listing of Federal programs which follows was derived in large part from the 1976 Catalog of Federal Domestic

Assistance, assembled by the Office of Management and Budget (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976). The listing also relies on past research sponsored by the National Center for Educational Statistics (Christoffel and Greenburg, A Compilation of Federal Programs Financing Post-secondary Education: An Update, Fall 1974) which was prepared by the Washington Office of the College Entrance Examination Board. The notation of relevant House and Senate Committees was derived from an unpublished listing prepared by the Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service and generously shared by Robert Andringa, Minority Staff Director, House Committee on Education and Labor.

While the list is rather comprehensive, some program exclusions should be noted. General student aid programs are omitted, for example, unless they are specifically directed toward teachers. Training of potential future faculty is more of a gray area, however. This listing does exclude the broad National Science Foundation programs which assist graduate students, even though at least some of these students would likely become teachers in the future. Finally, as noted on the list, programs are marked + which have at least some component directly supporting the professional development of teachers, instructors, or college faculty.

At the time this listing was prepared (July 1976) a number of pieces of important legislation were pending in the Congress. In particular legislation authorizing the various health

manpower programs as well as vocational and higher education programs was being considered. When finally enacted, these laws may have the effect of abolishing some of the programs included in this list or adding totally new ones.

-- Pamela Christoffel

FEDERAL PROGRAMS PROVIDING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Administering Agency and Program	OMB Catalog Number*	House Committee	Senate Committee
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration			
+Sea Grant Support	11.417	Mer. Mar. & Fish.	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE			
Defense Civil Preparedness Agency			
Civil Defense Architect/Engineer Programs	12.301 and 12.324	Armed Services	Armed Services
+Civil Defense-Staff College	------	Armed Services	Armed Services
+Civil Defense Staff College Student Expense Program	12.314	Armed Services	Armed Services
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE			
Administration on Aging**			
Special Programs for the Aging--Model Projects	13.634	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Special Programs for the Aging--Nutrition Program	13.635	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+Special Programs for the Aging--Training	13.637	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare

*Refers to the 1976 Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, assembled by the Office of Management and Budget. Programs listed which have no number do not appear in the 1976 edition of the Catalog.

**This agency is now a part of HEW's Office of Human Development

+These programs have at least some component directly supporting the professional development of college faculty, teachers, or instructors.

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration			
Alcohol Community Service Programs	13.251	Interstate & Foreign Commerce	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+Alcohol Fellowship Program	------	"	"
+Alcohol National Research Service Awards	13.272	"	"
+Alcohol Research Development Awards	13.271	"	"
Alcohol Training Programs	13.274	"	"
Drug Abuse Demonstration Programs	13.254	"	"
Drug Abuse Education	13.275	"	"
+Drug Abuse Fellowships	------	"	"
+Drug Abuse National Research Service Awards	13.278	"	"
+Drug Abuse Research Development Awards	13.277	"	"
Drug Abuse Training Programs	13.280	"	"
+Mental Health Fellowships	------	"	"
+Mental Health--Hospital Staff Development Grants	13.238	"	"
+Mental Health National Research Service Awards	13.282	"	"
+Mental Health Research Development Awards	13.281	"	"
+Mental Health Training Grants	13.244	"	"
Center for Disease Control			
Investigations, Surveillance and Technical Assistance	13.283	Inter. & For. Comm.	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Occupational Safety and Health Training Grants	13.263	"	"
Health Resources Administration			
Associated Health Professions--Special Programs	------	Inter. & For. Comm.	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Associated Health Professions--Special Improvement Grants	------	"	"
Associated Health Professions--Special Project Grants	13.305	"	"
+Associated Health Professions--Traineeship Grants for Advanced Training	------	"	"
Training in Expanded Auxiliary Management (TEAM)	13.319	"	"

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
Graduate Training In Public Health--Project Grants	------	Inter. &. For. Comm.	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Family Medicine Training Grants	13.379	"	"
Health Professions--Special Projects	13.383	"	"
Nurse Scientist Training Grants	------	"	"
Nurse Training Improvement--Special Projects	13.359	"	"
Nursing Research Project Grants and Contracts	13.361	"	"
+Professional Nurse Traineeships	13.358	"	"
Professional Public Health Personnel--Traineeships	------	"	"
+Special Pre-Doctoral and Post-Doctoral Fellowships in Nursing Research	------	"	"
Health Services Administration			
Family Planning Services Training Grants	13.260	Inter. & For. Comm.	Finance
+Maternal and Child Health Training	13.233	"	"
National Institutes of Health			
+Aging Research and Training	13.866	Inter. & For. Comm.	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+Allergy and Infectious Diseases Research and Training	13.855 and 13.856	"	"
+Cancer Research Manpower	13.398	"	"
Child Health and Human Development Research and Training	13.864 and 13.865	"	"
+Dental Research and Training	13.840 through 13.845 13.878	"	"
+Environmental Health Sciences Research and Training	13.872 through 13.876	"	"
+Eye Research and Training	13.867 through 13.871	"	"
+General Medical Sciences	13.859 through 13.864	"	"
+Heart and Lung Research and Training	13.837 through 13.839	"	"
+Neurological Diseases and Stroke Research and Training	13.851 through 13.854	"	"
+Laboratory Animal Science and Primate Research and Training	13.306	"	"

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
+ Minority Access to Research Careers	13.880	Inter. & For. Comm.	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Health Science and Computer Technology Training	13.881	"	"
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education			
+ Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	13.925	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Office of Education			
+Education for Gifted and Talented Children and Youth	13.562	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+Educationally Deprived Children--Handicapped	13.427	"	"
Handicapped--Early Childhood Assistance	13.444	"	"
+Handicapped Innovative Programs--Deaf Blind Centers	13.445	"	"
Handicapped Innovative Programs--Programs for Severely Handicapped Children	13.568	"	"
+Handicapped Media Services and Captioned Films	13.446	"	"
+Handicapped Regional Resource Centers	13.450	"	"
Handicapped--Research and Demonstration	13.443	"	"
+Handicapped Personnel Preparation	13.451	"	"
+Handicapped Teacher Recruitment and Information	13.452	"	"
+Special Programs for Children with Specific Learning Disabilities	13.520	"	"
+Educational Personnel Development--Urban-Rural School Development	13.505	"	"
+Teacher Corps--Operations and Training	13.489	"	"
+Vocational Education Personnel Development Awards	13.503	"	"
+Vocational Education Personnel Development--State Systems Program	13.504	"	"
+Emergency School Aid	13.525 through 13.529, 13.532	"	"
+College Teacher Graduate Fellowships	13.407	"	"
+Ellender Fellowships	-----	"	"
+Higher Education--Land-Grant Colleges and Universities	13.453	"	"
+Higher Education--Strengthening Developing Institutions	13.454	"	"

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
Mining and Mineral Fuel Conservation Fellowship Program	13.567	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+ National Direct Student Loan Cancellations	13.470	"	"
+ National Direct Student Loan--Direct Loans	13.471	"	"
+ Public Service Professional Education--Institutional Grants and Fellowships	13.555	"	"
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students	13.482	"	"
University Community Service--Grants to States	13.491	"	"
+ Adult Education--Basic Grants to States	13.400	"	"
Bilingual Vocational Training	13.558	"	"
+ Community Education	13.563	"	"
+ Consumers' Education	13.564	"	"
+ Metric Education	13.561	"	"
+ Vocational Education Basic Grants to States	13.493	"	"
+ Vocational Education--Consumer and Homemaking	13.494	"	"
Vocational Education--Cooperative Education	13.495	"	"
+ Vocational Education--Curriculum Development	13.496	"	"
Vocational Education--Special Needs	13.499	"	"
+ Bilingual Education	13.403	"	"
+ Educationally Deprived Children (Teacher Training)	13.428 through 13.429, 13.431	"	"
+ Strengthening State Departments of Education--Grants to States	13.486	"	"
+ Ethnic Heritage Studies Program	13.549	"	"
+ Foreign Language and Area Studies--Fellowships	13.434	"	"
+ Foreign Language and ARea Studies--Centers	13.435	"	"
+ Foreign Language and Area Studies--Research	13.436	"	"
+ Fulbright-Hays Training Grant--Faculty Research Abroad	13.438	"	"
+ Fulbright-Hays Training Grants--Foreign Curriculum Consultants	13.439	"	"
+ Fulbright-Hays Training Grants--Group Projects Abroad	13.440	"	"
+ Fulbright-Hays Training Grants--Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad	13.441	"	"
+ Teacher Exchange	13.437	"	"

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
+Career Education	13.554	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training	13.405	"	"
+Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention	13.420	"	"
+Environmental Education	13.522	"	"
+Right to Read	13.533	"	"
+Indian Teacher Training	13.546	"	"
Office of Human Development			
+Developmental Disabilities--Demonstration Facilities and Training	13.632	Inter. & For. Comm.	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Developmental Disabilities--Special Projects	13.631	"	"
Rehabilitation Services and Facilities--Special Projects	13.626	"	"
Rehabilitation Training	13.629	"	"
Social and Rehabilitation Service			
Public Assistance--State and Local Training	13.724	Ways & Means	Finance
Public Assistance Training Grants	13.772	"	"
+Training Grants in the Field of Child Welfare	13.768	"	"
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Bureau of Indian Affairs			
Indian Action Team Program	15.107	Interior & Insular Affairs	Interior & Insular Affairs
Indian Law Enforcement Services	15.131	"	"
Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration			
Mine Health and Safety Education and Training	15.352	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
National Park Service			
Training Institute for Park and Recreation Management	15.911	Int. & Ins. Affairs	Int. & Ins. Affairs
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
Drug Enforcement Administration			
Law Enforcement Assistance--Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Training	16.004	Judiciary	Judiciary
Federal Bureau of Investigation			
Law Enforcement Assistance--FBI Advanced Police Training	16.300	Judiciary	Judiciary
Law Enforcement Assistance--FBI Field Police Training	16.302		
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration			
+Law Enforcement Assistance Educational Development	16.511	Judiciary	Judiciary
+Law Enforcement Assistance JJDP National Institute	16.518		
Law Enforcement Assistance--Technical Assistance	16.503		
Law Enforcement Assistance--Training	16.513		
+Law Enforcement Research and Development--Graduate Research Fellowships	16.505		
+Law Enforcement Research and Development--Visiting Fellowships	16.508		

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Employment and Training Administration			
+ Employment and Training Research--Doctoral Dissertation Grants	17.218	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Occupational Safety and Health Administration			
+ Occupation Safety and Health	17.500	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
+ Educational Exchange--University Lecturers (Professors) and Research Scholars	19.102	Foreign Affairs	Foreign Relations
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Federal Aviation Administration			
Aviation Education	20.100	Public Works	Aeronautics
Urban Mass Transportation Administration			
+ Urban Mass Transportation Grants for University Research and Training	20.502	Banking & Currency	Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs
Urban Mass Transportation Managerial Training Grants	20.503	"	"

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
ACTION			
National Student Volunteer Program	72.005	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Peace Corps	------	Foreign Affairs	Foreign Relations
+University Year for Action	72.004	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
APPALACHIAN NATIONAL COMMISSION			
Research, Technical Assistance and Demonstration Projects	23.011	Public Works	Public Works
ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION			
+Faculty and Student Participation	24.004	Joint Atom. Energy & Science & Technology	Joint Atom. Energy & Int. & Ins. Affairs
+Faculty Training Institutes and Workshops	24.007	"	"
Traineeships	24.020	"	"
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY			
Air Pollution Control Manpower Training Grants	66.003	Inter. & For. Comm.	Public Works
Water Pollution Control--Professional Training Grants	66.428	Public Works	"
+Water Pollution Control--State and Local Manpower Program Development	66.420	"	"
Water Pollution Control Fellowships	66.430	"	"

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES			
National Endowment for the Arts			
+ Architecture and Environmental Arts	45.001	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+ Public Media	45.006	"	"
Expansion Arts	45.010	"	"
Museums	45.012	"	"
National Endowment for the Humanities			
Fellowships and Stipends for the Professions	45.109	Education & Labor	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+ Education Pilot Program and Development	45.110	"	"
+ Education Projects	45.111	"	"
+ Summer Seminars for College Teachers	45.116	"	"
+ Fellowships for Independent Study and Research	45.118	"	"
+ Fellowships in Residence for College Teachers	45.119	"	"
+ National Humanities Institutes	45.120	"	"
+ Summer Stipends	45.121	"	"
+ Fellowships at Centers for Advanced Study	45.122	"	"
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION			
+ International Cooperative Scientific Activities	47.014	Sci. & Astronautics	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
Science and Society Program	47.038	"	"
+ Science Education Improvement	47.048	"	"
+ Science Manpower Improvement	47.009	"	"
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION			
+ Academic Appointments	60.002	House Admin.	Lab. & Pub. Welfare

		(House Committee)	(Senate Committee)
+ Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies	60.004	House Admin.	Public Works
+ Visiting Research Appointments	60.019	"	Lab. & Pub. Welfare
+ Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars--Fellowships and Guest Scholar Programs	60.020	"	"
+ Education Services--Elementary and Secondary Education	60.005	"	"
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
Biomedical Research--Career Development	------	Veteran's Affairs	Veteran's Affairs

National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development

Suite 308 · 1111 20th Street N.W. · Washington, DC 20036 · (202) 653-6169

Following is a list of reports published by the Council which are currently available. If copies are desired, simply check the item(s), tear out this page and return it to the address shown above. (There is no charge for these reports.)

1. Mainstreaming: Helping Teachers Meet the Challenge, Summer 1976.
2. Competency Based Teacher Education: Toward a Consensus, Spring 1976.
3. Annual Report for 1975, January 1976.
4. Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue?, July 1975. (SP 009 330)*
5. Gatekeepers in Education: A Report on Institutional Licensing, April 1975. (SP 008970)*
6. Evaluation of Education: In Need of Examination, November-December 1973. (ED 084 239)*
7. Vocational Education: Staff Development Priorities for the 70's, March 1973. (Full report: ED 084 240; Summary: ED 084 401)*
8. People for the People's College, Spring 1972. (ED 066 432)*
9. Report on Educational Renewal, March 1972.
10. Windows to the Bureaucracy, January 1972. (ED 083 188)*
11. Leadership and Educational Needs of the Nation, October 1969.

*These are ERIC numbers; copies of these reports may also be ordered through the ERIC System.

Send to: _____

(please print) _____

_____

_____